UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA SAVANNAH DIVISION

CHARLES C. LEVY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
V.)	CV424-138
VANEAL MCKINNY, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	
	ORDER	

Proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, Plaintiff Charles C. Levy brought this apparent 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against several private individuals with whom he was in conflict. See doc. 1 at 5-8. The Court granted Levy's request to pursue his case in forma pauperis (IFP), doc. 4, and ordered him to return the necessary forms by August 22, 2024, id. at

4-5. Levy then consented to plenary disposition of his case by the undersigned United States magistrate judge. See docs. 7 & 8; see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). Levy filed his consent to collection of fees from his

prisoner trust account with the Court on July 15, 2024.1 Doc. 6.

¹ Pursuant to the "prison mailbox rule," Levy's form is deemed filed on the date he signed it. *See, e.g., Washington v. United States*, 243 F.3d 1299, 1301 (11th Cir. 2001).

However, he never filed his prisoner trust account statement form. See generally, docket.

A district court retains the inherent power to police its docket and to enforce its orders. Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); Jones v. Graham, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983); Brown v. Tallahassee Police Dept., 205 F. App'x 802, 802 (11th Cir. 2006). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a complaint may be dismissed either for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with an order of the Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Additionally, this Court's Local Rules court. provide that the Court may dismiss an action for want of prosecution when a party has "willful[ly] disobe[yed] . . . any order of the Court" or for "[a]ny other failure to prosecute a civil action with reasonable promptness." S.D. Ga. L.R. 41.1(b), (c). The Court's prior Order expressly warned Levy of the consequences of failing to comply with its instructions. See doc. 4 at 5. Levy's failure to prosecute this case and failure to respond to the Court's Order warrant dismissal. Accordingly, his Complaint is **DISMISSED** for failing to obey a court order and failing

to prosecute his case. Doc. 1. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **CLOSE** this case.

SO ORDERED, this 23rd day of October, 2024.

CHRISTOPHER L. RAY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA